

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2007.

In response to the requirement by the examiner, the title of the invention has been amended. The amended title is believed to be descriptive of the invention .

In response to the objection, the numbers for the at issue "means" in claim 1 have been corrected to remove the objection from claim 1.

The Examiner notes that claim 3 contains allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim.

Per the above amendment, claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 (the base claim). Therefore, amended claim 3 should be formally allowed.

As newly added claim 6 depends from claim 3, claim 6 should therefore also be formally allowed.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parulski et al (US5440343) in combination with Eikenberg (US6628751).

Per the above amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite the additional limitations: "the second means comprises a guide bar, means for slidably supporting the holder on the guide bar, a movable member, and means for moving the holder along the guide bar in accordance with movement of the movable member". The additional limitations are similar to the limitations in original claim 3 which the examiner has deemed to constitute allowable subject matter. Applicants confirm the examiner's view that those

limitations added to claim 1 are taught by neither Parulski nor Eikenberg. Amended claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Claim 2 is also believed to be allowable, as it depends from amended claim 1.

Per the above amendment, claim 4 has been amended to recite the additional limitations: "the second means comprises a holder for retaining the solid-state imaging element array, a guide bar, means for slidably supporting the holder on the guide bar, a movable member, and means for moving the holder along the guide bar in accordance with movement of the movable member". These limitations are similar to the limitations in original claim 3 which the examiner deems to be allowable subject matter, and which the applicants confirm are taught by neither Parulski nor Eikenberg. Therefore, amended claim 4 is believed to be allowable.

Claim 5 is also believed to be allowable, as it depends from amended claim 4.

Newly added claim 7 depends from amended claim 4. Claim 7 has the limitation that the movable member comprises a movable lever. Such movable lever is believed not taught by Parulski and Eikenberg. Therefore, claim 7 is believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application and pass the same to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: July 2, 2007